SHRI K. R. MALKANI: Okay, you call him.

उपसभापति: मंत्री जी, आप बोलिए।

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Comprehensive test ban treaty (C.T.B.T.)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Madam, before I make the statement I seek your permission and, through you, the permission of the hon. House that as the circulation of the statement will take about half-an-hour more and the Hindi version will be available in the afternoon, if the hon. Members are willing to accommodate me, I will make the statement just now.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: You make it in the evening.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us hear him. It is a serious matter. I think without a copy of the statement you have been listening to the Ministers. Why should you have a copy? You can make notes and put the questions. Yes, Minister, you can make the statement.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: This Hon'ble House will recall that I had made a *suo moto* statement regarding the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on 26 the August 1996, outlining our assessment of the developments in Ganeva and our approach during the discussions in the General Assembly in New York. The discussion that followed was heartening in that it reflected a national consensus on an issue which the Government considers to be of vital national importance. The strength of the national consensus is reflected in the policy of this Government and the course of action which was adopted during the discussions in New York. Today, may I, with your permission take this opportunity to brief the Hon'ble House on the developments in the resumed session of the 50th UN General Assembly in New York.

As Hon'ble Members are aware, we had withheld consensus on the draft text of the CTBT in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva because it fell far short of the mandate in all its aspects. It is not a "comprehensive treaty"—it permits the nuclear weapon States to continue their weapons related research and development activity using non-explosive technologies. It lacks any meaningful commitment to nuclear disarmament and instead of being the definitive first step of the nuclear disarmament process, it only serves to perpetuate the existing discriminatory *status quo*. Consequently, the draft text cannot contribute to the enhancement of international peace and security.

From India's point of view, the treaty also had an unacceptable provision in Article XIV dealing with Entry Into Force which seeks to impose obligations on India despite our clearly stated position that India would not subscribe to this text. Hon'ble members are aware that we have made known our strong objections to this formulation, in bilateral discussions and in multilateral fora. As this provision was not modified, India was obliged to convey its opposition to the text, both in Geneva and in New York.

Through a procedural manoeuvre, the draft text was introduced in the resumed session of the 50th UN General Assembly in New York. We made it clear to the President of the UN General Assembly and all other delegations that such an approach did not obscure the fact that this text is a non-consensus text which does not fulfil the mandate given to the Conference on Disarmament. Subsequently, we have also informed the President of the UN General Assembly and all delegations about the amendments that would be required for the draft treaty to meet the mandate of the Conference on disarmament. In doing so, we have placed our concerns, regarding the procedure and the shortcomings in the draft treaty text on record. Hon'ble Members are aware that our amendments called for a commitment to nuclear disarmament within a timebound framework and for a genuinely comprehensive treaty which commits all countries to refrain from any activity relating to the development, refinement and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. We also have, in this document, put forward our amendment relating to Article XIV regarding Entry Into Force.

The deliberations in the UN General Assembly session concluded last night with the adoption of a resolution, adopting the flawed text of the CTBT and calling for a signing

conference to be convened at an early date. 158 countries voted in favour of the Australian proposal which was co-sponsored by 126 countries. Libya and Bhutan, along with India, voted against the resolution. We particularly appreciate the fact that neighbouring Bhutan, with whom we enjoy traditional ties of close friendship and understanding, has shared our perceptions. Similarly, it is a matter of satisfaction that Mauritius, with whom we share close ties, expressed understanding regarding our position and chose to abstain on the resolution. In all, five countries abstained on the resolution. It is worth noting that though the resolution has 126 co-sponsors, many non aligned countries who have taken an active interest on this issue have refrained from co-sponsoring the resolution. These include, among others, Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Arab Republic of Egypt, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Mexico.

The vote was preceded by an active debate which forcused on the disarmament perspective in which a CTBT should have been placed. Participating in the debat were several NAM countries. There was a widespread expression of concern over the procedure adopted and apprehension that it may erode the credibility of the Conference on Disarmament. A large number of countries expressed dissatisfaction with the Entry Into Force provisions as being unprecedented and an unwelcome departure from customary international law. The intrinsic shortcomings of the treaty text were highlighted by non-aligned delegations participating in the debate, reflecting a shared perception with India. In our discussions, many countries have assured us that they recognise the validity of our concerns. We have the distinct impression that even after the adoption of the text, there is an uneasiness on the part of many delegations about what has really been achieved and the manner in which it has been brought about.

There is an understanding of India's position in the international community. The Government has taken necessary steps to sustain a dialogue with all friendly countries in order to explain the rationale for our approach. We are confident that our bilateral relations with countries will not be affected by our differences on this issue. In fact, our candid and transparent attitude and continued dialogues despite differences in perception, have ensured that our voice has been heard with respect. I must convey my gratitude to the Hon'ble Members because it is the consensus in this House and in the nation as a whole that has given strength and credibility to the Government's stand.

As regards what might happen in future, I would like to assure this House that we will maintain our position and not sign the CTBT. The Entry Into Force provision will ensure that this treaty shall never enter into force unless its proponents agree to amend this provision in order to remove any possibility of imposing any obligations on India. There have been no pressures on India and if there are any in future, I am confident that this country has the national will to withstand such pressures.

The discussions in the UN General Assembly have clearly shown that there is growing support for adopting a comprehensive, phased and timebound programme for nuclear disarmament. We will continue to take initiatives in the United Nations and other fora in keeping with our consistent and principled policy for achieving progress towards our shared goal of a nuclear weapon free world which will enhance India's security and also global security.

While thanking you, Madam, I would also say that we are circulating to the Members, in addition to the copy of the statement made, a copy of the text of the speech made by our Ambassador, while opposing it, in the United Nations.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Madam, I have no words to compliment the Government for taking a bold stand at the United Nations. This country has called a spade a spade. There are other countries — I read in the Press — who have voted for the Revolution but they are not going to sign the CTBT. This national strength we have, Madam.

Our Ambassador has mentioned that we will not sign this treaty now and not even later. I think that this is a very good stand and the hon. Minister also has mentioned it in his statement. The hon. Minister has also mentioned that there is no political pressure on this country. But we cannot deny the fact that nuclear imperialism is playing around this country. Yesterday we

raised the issue of attack on Siachen Glacier. And this attack came only after the U.S.A. implemented the Brown Amendment. Arms were supplied to Pakistan and these arms are being used against India. We cannot be blind towards this arm-twisting tactic. We have to also know the scenario around the world at the time when the CTBT was discussed at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. France was having nuclear explosion in the Pacific and Australia objected to it. Madam, on 27th July, when talks were supposed to resume for the second time, China exploded a nuclear device. And in the last week we saw how the U.S. bombarded Iraq. All these three countries are permanent Members of the Security Council and these are the nuclear powers. I do not know what message they have to give to the other countries. I understand that 158 countries voted for it, three against it and five abstained. The total membership of the United Nations in 296, if I am not mistaken; I stand to be corrected. I don't think that the whole world is serious about what is going on at the General Assembly. It is also shown by the very fact that Australia moved a Resolution but there was no unanimity. It did not have the approval of the Conference on Disarmament because there was no unanimity and it was vetoed. I think that Australia had a problem about the nuclear test in the Pacific by France, a permanent member of the Security Council. So, I don't think that they have any quarrel with India. Again, the hon. Minister has rightly clarified about clause 14, namely, 'Entry into force'. Sixty-one countries are member-countries at the Geneva Conference on CTBT and for enforcing it, 44 countries have to sign it. Our neighbouring countries also, though they had voted for the Resolution yesterday, are not going to sign the CTBT. Madam, I would want the hon. Minister to clarify this. The 'Entry into force' clause can be enforced when we are party to the agreement. When India has said that it is not going to sign it, how can this clause be enforced? I don't think that clause 14 will come into play. So the whole exercise becomes a mockery. I would want the hon. Minister to explain to the House as to how this clause will be enforced and also explain why there was a big noise about CTBT. The principal issue, main issue, at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva was disarming the nuclear powers, five nuclear powers. So I hope that the hon. Minister will reply to my point very clearly as to whether the clause 'Entry into force' will be applicable and whether they can enforce it on us.

1.00 P.M.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, at the very outset let me congratulate the Foreign Minister of the country for taking a very, very bold and principled stand even to the point of risking isolation, for the time being. I feel that there is nothing to be afraid of, as far as isolation is concerned. In 1953, if I recollect correctly, the Americans wanted us to join an American military Pact. Pt. Nehru, at that time, refused and when he refused the Americans went to Pakistan and then got the 1954 military Pact signed with Pakistan, and eventually, the Baghdad Treaty and other treaties came into being. Because India refused to join that pact and as far as Mr. John Foster Dulles was the Foreign Minister of the United States, they harassed India at every point, including passing resolutions in the United Nations, tried to bring sanctions against the Indian Government on Kashmir, but thanks to the veto of the Soviet Union and other parties, we managed to survive those resolutions and those resolutions were not made effective. But the point I am making is this. The principled stand which was taken by our country at that time was rewarded later. When Africa became independent—most of the countries in Africa became independent in the sixties — they all joined the Non-Aligned Movement and the Non-Aligned Movement became very powerful. So, we should not be afraid of the isolation, for the time being.

At the same time, let me point out that the Americans have a long record of violating international resolutions. On Israel, on South Africa, on Iraq and on several occasions they have taken actions in complete disregard of the world opinion. So, they have no moral right to threaten us and to say why we are going this way despite the opinion that has been expressed in the General Assembly. I remember in the seventies and in the eighties....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not having a debate on this. We are only putting questions. I have to adjourn the House for lunch.

Let me first take the permission of the House that we cannot have the lunch hour for some time till we finish it.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I will just take two-three minutes.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: महोदया, जीरो आवर मेंशन और स्पशेल मेंशन कब होंगे?

THE DEUTY CHAIRMAN: We will take it up after the lunch hour. Only two Zero Hour mentions are left.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: There are eight Special Mentions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will take them up in the evening. We have some Business over here and Special Mentions can be taken up in the evening.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANADES: Madam, we can forgo the lunch today.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have two Zero Hour mentions and we will take them up after lunch.

SHRI RAGHAVJI: Madam, Special Mentions should also be taken up after the lunch hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't wast the time. Please don't dispute it. Yes, Dr. Dasgupta.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, if I recollect correctly, in the seventies and in the eighties, when a number of resolutions were passed against the United States in various international fora, they decided to boycott these international fora. They opted out of the UNESCO; they opted out of the ILO; they refused to fund the United Nations; they refused to host the United Nations in New York. At one stage, when a resolution was passed in the General Assembly to invite Yasser Arafat to speak in the General Assembly, the Americans refused him visa and then the General Assembly had to be held in Geneva. It was held in the Old Palars de Nations Building in Geneva. what I am saying is this. The Americans have a long record of violating and flouting world opinion. So, they have no moral right to sit on judgment on the decision we have taken. I have just three questions to put. My first question is this.

Our name is there among the list of 40 odd countries whose agreement is necessary to put the treaty into effect. If it is still there in the resolution which has been passed, does it make the resolution infructuous, if we don't agree with that? This is my first question. My second question is this. As you have already stated, there are many countries in the world which didn't dare to vote against if for a variety of reasons. Because there is a single super power in the world today, they were bullied, they were blackmailed and they were threatened. So, what kind of diplomatic offensive are we going to take to ensure that the world opinion—no matter what has happened in the General Assembly debate—remains with us and what action are we unitedly going to take to win over a large number of countries in Africa, in Latin America and in Asia? There has been some success which you have recorded, but I would like to know more about the diplomatic initiative which you are going to take.

My third question is this. I am sure that the Americans are not going to rest with this resolution, they are certainly going to put all kinds of pressures on us, subtle and not so subtle. I would like to know from the Minister whether he can give us some indications of the kind of pressure which is being put on us to comply with the resolution which has been passed.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Thank you, Madam. I congratulate the hon. Foreign Minister, Shri Gujral, for his statement. I am happy that he has made this. I appreciate especially that part of his statement where he says that the principled stand India has taken derives its strength from national consensus. I am sure, the signal will go to the entire world that so far as India is concerned, in this particular matter, there is a national consensus within the Parliament and all over the country. I think, that is certainly going to strengthen the national will to resist any kind of pressure in times to come. Probably, it will deter other countries who want to put any kind of pressure.

Madam, the hon. Minister has rightly pointed out that through some procedural manoeuvre this issue has been brought before the U.N., but our Ambassador who is there, has certainly explained our principled stand. I think,

he has done it very effectively. The Minister has assured us that his entire statement will be with us. If I have understood correctly from some newspaper reporting, probably, some alternative para or some alternative draft or some additional para has been suggested by Ambassador. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether that is also being circulated and whether it constitutes a part of his statement. But India again must emphasise our viewpoint since certain countries have also expressed misgivings about the particular trick which has been played in resorting to this procedure. This is going to reflect very adversely on the working of the United Nations, particularly this year when we are thinking of reorganising the United Nations. If such manoeuvres can be resortd to by those who consider themselves as strong powers, the very existence of the United Nations Organisation will be in danger.

I would also like to know a little bit more about article 14. I do not want to repeat the same thing about America or anything of bressure, but article 14 of the treaty has been discussed very often. A difficulty may arise after three years. I am also aware that as far as the Minister is concerned, probably, it will be difficult for him to give any indication at this moment of time or to anticipate the kind of strategy that may be adopted by some of those who consider themselves as policemen of the entire world. Still, I would like to know the thinking of the Govt. a little bit. The track record of the U.S. and some of the countries shows that there will be atempts of all kinds, in economic matters or in defence and so on. I think, a little more thought to this will have to be given and some kind of national consensus will have to be evolved on this. In any case, if some study by the Ministry has been made and if something has been thought about it or if there are certain indications from other countries of any kind of arm-twisting in this regard which are understood to be intrinsic possibilities, and which would be deleterious to us under article 14, I would like to know. If the hon. Minister can tell us something, it will be worth-while.

One more point I would like to make is about the kind of stand Pakistan has taken.

It is changing its stand from time to time and giving some assurance to Australia and so on and then refraining from doing what it assured earlier. It exposes the hostility that Pakistan has towards our country and against our principled stand on security matters. When we view our security matters, it is done not only in the Indian context, but for the whole world. I think this is a strong point for us. We should try to build on this and evoke the goodwill of others. We should try to alleviate the kind of hostility and criticism that Pakistan makes in other countries against India.

Lastly, Madam, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has any clue as to what kind of national interest is involved in the case of the five countries which did not vote against the Treaty; though still it is true again. As far as Bhutan is concerned, has it also opposed treaty or has it just refrained and apreciated our stand and so on? Thank you very much.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam, I have no hesitation in expressing a serious doubt—maybe, this is the feeling of whole Indian nation—whether the United Nations Organisation is on the point of losing its inherited importance; whether UNO is gradually disintegrating. The world forum that the world had built up—maybe, after the Second World War—the people had expected that UNO would become an important weapon in ensuring that one single nation does not rule the world. If Hitler had failed, if Mussolin had failed, definitely, our intention was to ensure that the American imperialism also does not succeed. The United Nations was built as a safeguard. Now it appears that it is losing its relevance, it is losing its role; UNO has become a tool in the hands of self-interest seeking political power of the world. This is the most unfortunate explanation or conclusion that one can draw. Madam, I would say that India does not feel lonely; we do not feel lonely; the Government should not feel lonely on the question of truth, on the question of justice and on the question of reason. There have been occasions when people became lonely. Even in the period of loneliness, we should fight -that is the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi; this is the teaching of Rabindranath Tagore. This is our great tradition. Our strength is our reason; our

strength is our farsightedness; our strength is defence of things that we consider to be important. Let the Government of India carry on the battle. You have all the best blessings of the Indian nation. The Indian nation stands united.

Madam, I feel sorry because many of the people, many of the nations in the world today, could be mobilised by America and its henchmen I feel sorry that there is so much of problem in the struggle of nonalignment. I feel sorry that many of our partners have taken recourse to wrong methods. I do not feel sorry for America. But, I feel sorry for many of our nations. This makes me more bold to fight it. Therefore, I think that India should carry on this battle relentlessly. One day, today or tomorrow, we shall succeed in mobilising a greater number of nations, a bigger number of people and isolate those who are doing help with the United Nations Organisation.

My questin is: considering the seriousness of the situation, considering the serious problem that is overtaking the United Nations, will the Government of India initiate active diplomacy to ensure that the serious rot that is setting in is really counteracted? The process of decline of the United Nations must be counteracted. Will the Government of India take diplomatic initiative in that regard?

The second one is; if an attempt is made to force on us the resolution that we have not signed then what are we going to do? My suggestion is: We should refuse, but, while refusing to carry out the resolution that we have not signed, we must try to mobilise people and States in our favour. Therefore, my question is: Will the Government of India shall explore all the possibilities of building public opinion not only to get the support of statesmen but also common people? In order to get the support of the common people, the Government of India should send delegations to different parts of the country, speak to Non-Governmental Organisations, speak to different political forces, speak to different important leading cultural and social organisations. Maybe some Government is opposing, but in order to build a public opinion in the Non-Governmental areas, there must be an initiative from our side. I wish the Government takes intiative in that direction. Thank you.

[The Vice-Chairman Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi in the Chair]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN IN THE CHAIR (TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Shrimati Margart Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (KARNATAKA): Sir, I know, a number of my colleagues have sponken but there two or three questions I would like to ask the hon. Minister in view of the shortage of time.

The first question is: What happens after three years? As per one of the clause, there would be a review to see what should be done to force the countries which have not signed endorsed it and what kind of collective action would be taken against those countries.

The second question is: In view of the fact that so few have actually stood by us — I congratulate the Government on the stand we have taken; I believe that it is a right stand and ultimately this will prevail. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether they have begun to look at what other pressures — covert, direct, indirect that would be brought on India particularly, as far as our economic development is concerned because that is the instrument which is going to be used against you in the coming years. I want to know whether the Government would take into confidence all the political parties, the leaders of our parties, and see whether a consensus or maybe, some changes even in your immediate economic policies to ensure national self-reliance, a certain amount of protection of your resources, and so on, is planned and opinion along these lines mobilised within the country.

Thirdly, I would like to ask the hon. Minister — Members have spoken about getting across the opinion of leaders in other countries and so on whether a serious attempt is being made to revive the Non-Aliened forum in one way or the other, on this very important issue. I think the Non-Aliened countries had taken a very clear united stand on the question of disarmament and so on in the past and all of them today cannot turn against their own country's committed stand on disarmament issues and the right of developing countries of the non-nuclear States as well as others to have

their own interests protected. I would, therefore, specially ask the hon. Minister who has a long innings in the international field, particularly, with the Non-Aliened Movement, what steps the Government is contemplating to revive some of these forums where India has played a very dominent role, so that some kind of a group which would stand together and express a common opinion could emerge in the coming months. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): The hon. Minister, please. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JOHN. F. FERNANDES (Goa): Sir, just one point. One hundred and forty-eight countries were not present. Are they supporting India's stand; if not in the United Nations. *(Interruptions)* Sir, they did not abstain. Out of a total of 296 countries, 148 countries were not present. Are these countries supporting India's stand? Have you received any communication from them on this? If not in the U.N. General Assembly Session, are they privately supporting us, on a nation-tonation basis? Tnank you.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. House for its support to the Government's stand. When I say I am grateful, thankful, I particularly, wish to thank the leaders of all political parties whom we have, all the time, taken into confidence on all the steps we have taken so far.

I do not mind revealing it that all the statements made by the Government in the U.N. fora, or, in Geneva, were in consultation with the leaders of all political parties. And that was our strength.

I can assure my friend, Mrs. Alva, that this would be the policy of the Govenrment of India always. It is because I look at the foreign policy of India as the foreign policy of India, and not as the foreign policy of any political party. Therefore, everything that we do must express the will, the programmes, the attitudes and the traditions of India as whole. This is what we are trying to do; and we will continue to do it. This I can assure the House.

I would now try to clarify one or two points which my hon. friends have raised. It has been asked: "what will happen now?' Weil; I think, in my statement, I have said. I will repeat it again.

Sir, it is very interesting. It is very ironical that Article 14 has been added. Forty-four names are there. Our name is also there. This says that only if they sign, it would come into force. We have said: "we will not sign it". Let us see. It is a very strange thing that they are doing for themselves. We have been saying all the time. In the case of NPT or any other international treaty, generally, it is said: "those who are willing to sign it are welcome to sign it'. But we did not sign the NPT. However, there was no "entry into force" clause in that. There was not this type of clause which is now being visualised or projected. We have said "no". When we say "no", we are expressing the will of the House. I repeat again that we shall say "no".

Now, they themselves put it into the treaty. Good wishes to them. They have...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: It is unimplementable.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: In a way, they themselves have defeated their own objective. This is what we have said. Although the word "veto" is not given in the United Nations'...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Is it unimplementable, Mr. Minister?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Although the word "veto" is not given in the United Nations' rules, I think, by implication, it has been achieved. The fault is not ours.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Mr. Minister, do we take it that, in reality, it is unimplementable?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: One minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NAT CHATURVEDI): That is an interpretation.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Do we take it that it is unimplementable?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: We have said so.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: That is it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: We will see.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: That was an important thing.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: It amounts to that.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: You can see from the speech of our Ambassador, which I am circulating. It has been very clearly stated in that speech as to what we are trying to do.

Sir, my friends have asked about the non-aligned movement. I am a strong supporter, I am a votary, of the nonaligned movement. I think this is one forum which we have to sustain. It is in our common interest. The non-aligned members were supportive, in Geneva, of the things that we were doing. Well; there are some difficulties. I do not want to recount them. But it is also a fact that whatever amendments we brought forward in Geneva, whatever our Ambassador said in New York, reflected the unanimous Resolution of NAM in cartagena. Therefore, this continues to be our policy. We will continue to sustain and strengthen the non-aligned movement. I am going to New York for the U. N. Session in a couple of weeks. There is a meeting of the non-aligned movement's Ministers also. I would contribute; I would raise your voice and reflect your support when I go there.

I might also point out what we have been doing. I have been constantly in touch with all the powers of the world. Up till now, I have written three letters to every Foreign Minister in the world, at various stages of the negotiations and at various stages of the happenings in the United Nations.

Therefore, no country in the world can ever say that we did not tell them. We are all the time telling them and our diplomacy has been very active in that and it will continue to be active. Activity does not always mean speeches. Activity in diplomacy has its own connotations and, therefore, we will continue to sustain that.

I think I have said about Bhutan, about which my friends have asked. Bhutan opposed the resolution as we did. So did Libya. All three of us opposed it. About others I have mentioned. As I have mentioned, they took different types of stands. Some abstained and some whent with the treaty.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Some countries absented themselves.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Well, I think we can all place our own construction. I will not give a judgement on that. It will not be wise for me to say as to what made them not to come, come or abstain. Well, let them look after themselves.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: It is a large number.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: A very large number, yes.

The other point my friends had raised was about the pressures. I think I had said it earlier and I might say this thing——and I say in all humility——that India's 97 crores of people have proved, time and again, in the freedom struggle and later on, that the Indian nation cannot be cowed down by anybody, and the Indian nation shall not be cowed down by anybody. We are not arrogant, we are not confrontationists, we don't go out of our way to create problems for other. But, surely, when our national interests are involved, whether we are alone or we are in company, we know how to stand on our own two feet and defend our interests—and that is what we are trying to do. And this is not because I am doing it. It is because this House is doing it, it is because the entire nation is doing it an all the political parties are doing it. And I say it here again that the strength of India is in this unanimity, and if we have been able to stand today and say what we have said and do what we have done and will continue to do what we think is in our national interests, neither the question of loneliness nor isolation—all these things are myths—arises. It is not for the first time that we are confronted with such a situation in our history. We have a long history, and next year we will be celebrating 50 years of that glorious history of our Independence, and I think it has fallen to our lot—to the nation and to this House—to uphold that tradition and the path which was blazed by Gandhiji and Nehru, and we shall sustain it. That is my promise to you. I will not let you down. Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you, Mr. Gujral. Now the House...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I want a small clarification which, I hope, he will give. Sir, an international opinion has to be created.

That is very important for us. ...*(Interruptions)*... Madam, kindly... ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOK NATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Narayanasamy, you look at my face.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: In this field whenever I speak, Mrs. Alva gets agitated. That is why I am telling you.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: That is a very wrong statement. I have better things to do than worry about what he says. ...*(Interruptions)*... He places too much importance on... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Because the hon. Minister has not laid stress on that point, I would like to submit to the hon. Minister to create an international opinion in favour of our country on CTBT. I think the diplomatic channels have not been up to the standard—that is my feeling. I want the hon. Minister to respond because when we are facing a powerful country like the United States, we should do it in a concerted way. That is why I want the hon. Minister to clarify.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOK NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you very much, but the Minister has already explained it.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Sir, let me say. I deeply regret it if my hon. friend has not been persuaded by our diplomacy. If what we have achieved is not a part of that diplomatic achievement, then I can't help it. This is the main point: Diplomacy is not only demonstrations, diplomacy is not sending deputations, diplomacy is not travelling abroad all the time. Diplomacy always evolves and responds to a situation as it judges best. We have acted as we judged best. We have stood on our feet, we have earned the respect of the nations and India has been taken note of. That is our achievement. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOK NATH CHATURVEDI): The House stands adjourned for an hour for lunch. We will meet again at 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty four minutes past two of the clock,

Shri Satish Agarwal in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATISH AGARWAL): Let us first dispose of the remaining Zero Hour mentions. Then we will take up the discussion on the working of the Ministry of Steel and Mines.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI: Sir, let us postpone these two for tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATISH AGARWAL): All right. If the House so wishes, I have no objection.

Now, we take up the debate on the working of the Ministry of Steel and Mines.

SHRI O.P. KOHLI: Sir, only two Zero Hour mentions are remaining.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATISH AGARWAL): You see, I said let us take up the remaining Zero Hour mentions. Mr. Malkani suggested to postpone them for tomorrow. Nobody protested. So, I announced that these are postponed for tomorrow. Now you say अभी दो ही रह गए है, ले लीजिए। तब आप सो रहे थे क्या।

श्री ओ.पी. कोहली (दिल्ली): नहीं, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उनके कहने से ...(व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATISH AGARWAL): It has already been decided. You should have protested when Mr. Malkani has made a suggestion to postpone its to tomorrow. When a senior Member of your party has made a suggestion. I accepted it. Yes, Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, you can initiate the discussion on the working of the Steel and Mines Ministry.

श्री ओ. पी. कोहली: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रोटेस्ट करने का टाईम भी कहां मिला!

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सतीश अग्रवाल): अब क्या हो गया, पोस्टपोंड हो गए। कल हो जाएंगे।

श्री ओ. पी. कोहली: कल के स्पेशल मेंशन आज हुए, आज के कल होंगे। स्पेशल मेंशन होंगे या नहीं?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सतीश अग्रवाल): जब हाऊस एक्सटेंड नहीं हो रहा है, बिजनेस ज्यादा है, तो कंडेंस होगा ही प्रोग्राम।

Though I am not on the panel of Vice-Chairman, I am sitting in the Chair. If you like me to sit after 6 o'clock, I will do so.

श्री ओ॰ पी॰ कोहली: लंच के बाद कहा गया था कि इसके बाद टेक-अप होंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सतीश अग्रवाल) : सिचुएशन रोज बदल रही है, दुनिया में बदल रही है।

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I must compliment the Chairman of Rajya Sabha as well as the Business Advisory Committee for permitting a discussion on the working of the Ministry of Steel and Mines, maybe, for the first time during a decade. Rajya Sabha never discussed the working of the Ministry of Steel and Mines at least for ten years. This is quite surprising and this is also in a way distressing. As you all know, steel and mines are the two most important ingredients for industrialisation, for economic growth, for the material prosperity of any economy and nation. There has been a default. This default is bound to be there because Parliament's scrutiny of these two Departments has rarely been made. At the beginning, may I know from the Minister whether there is a steel policy at all? May I know from the Minister whether there is a mineral policy at all? It is not the fault of one Government. It is a perpetual fault committed by the Governments that came into power.

Sir, in the present Budget there has been a reduction in the import duty of steel. There has been an increase in excise duty of steel. As a result, the production of steel in the country has become dearer comparatively and import of steel has become cheap in a way. This is the paradoxical situation. In the name of liberalisation, the steel producing industry of the country has been—maybe, unintentionally—put in a serious dilemma. Therefore, there has been an attempt to import steel when we are producing enough or, maybe, marginally below the requirement. Over and above the problem of overproduction, the problem of oversupply, I mean, is compounded by unethical and unfettered dumping of steel that is being carried on by a number of foreign firms, by a number of foreign powers, including the former socialist States of the Soviet Union and the unethical dumping resorted to by Japan. The most important point is the antidumping law in our country is highly defective whereas the anti-dumping law in most of the advanced capitalist countries is quite strict and indiscriminate. This country has enacted a law which is loose and lax. In America the onus of proof is on the importer. It has to prove that it is not dumping. In India it is the prosecution that has to clarify and that has to substantiate it. It is the prosecution that has to substantiate that it is dumping. It is the other way round.

As a result, there is the serious problem of dumping in the country. As a result, the steel industry, I am constrained to point out, is seriously at crossroads. On the other hand, despite the tall claim made by our Finance Minister and by the former Finance Minister regarding the revivial of the economy, the demand for steel in almost stagnant. The engineering industry has not picked up. Only the construction industry is really looking up. As a result, therefore, the demand is almost stagnant. And there is a glut, there is over-supply, and therefore, the problem of the steel industry is more than what we believe it to be. It is for the Government to take immediate steps, it is for the Government to take recourse to a strict anti-dumping law, it is for the Government to ensure that the Budget is not framed in a way that it counteracts against our own strategy for bringing up the steel industry in the country by making import cheap and by making production costly which is quite paradoxical and inconsistent with the national interest.

The Vice-Chairman (Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi) in the chair.

Secondly, I must warn the Government and the country that there is an attempt by the international steel industry, there is an attempt by the international steel tycoons, to re-locate their polluting steel production in India. Since the problem of pollution is deeply connected with the production of steel and because the problem of pollution is being tackled on a different footing in most of the countries,